

1 AN ACT Relating to establishing guidelines for government
2 procurement and use of automated decision systems in order to protect
3 consumers, improve transparency, and create more market
4 predictability; adding a new section to chapter 49.60 RCW; adding a
5 new chapter to Title 43 RCW; and declaring an emergency.

6 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

7 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 1.** The legislature finds that:

8 (1) Washington is a technology leader on a national and global
9 level and holds a distinctive position in creating frameworks around
10 technology that enhance innovation while protecting consumers and
11 promoting fairness, accountability, and transparency for all
12 Washingtonians.

13 (2) Automated decision systems are rapidly being adopted to make
14 or assist in core decisions in a variety of government and business
15 functions, including criminal justice, health care, education,
16 employment, public benefits, insurance, and commerce.

17 (3) These automated decision systems are currently unregulated,
18 may be deployed without public notice, and vendors selling the
19 systems may require restrictive contractual provisions that undermine
20 government transparency and accountability.

1 (4) The average Washington resident is unlikely to understand
2 processes used by these automated decision systems, yet these systems
3 are increasingly used to make core government and business decisions
4 impacting the civil rights and liberties of Washingtonians, raising
5 significant concerns around due process, fairness, accountability,
6 and transparency.

7 (5) A growing body of research shows that reliance on automated
8 decision systems without adequate transparency, oversight, or
9 safeguards can undermine market predictability, harm consumers, and
10 deny historically disadvantaged or vulnerable groups the full measure
11 of their civil rights and liberties.

12 (6) Research has shown that even the most innocent looking
13 management tools often incorporate and compound the assumptions of
14 institutional racism and other unfounded stereotypes. It is a matter
15 of good governance to ensure that agencies consider whether the
16 technologies they use improperly advantage or disadvantage Washington
17 residents.

18 (7) In order to enhance innovation and ensure the use of these
19 systems in ways that benefit Washington residents, the legislature
20 intends to ensure the fair, transparent, and accountable use of
21 automated decision systems.

22 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 2.** The definitions in this section apply
23 throughout this chapter unless the context clearly requires
24 otherwise.

25 (1) "Agency" or "public agency" means any state executive office,
26 agency, department, board, commission, committee, educational
27 institution, or other state agency created by or pursuant to statute,
28 other than courts and the legislature.

29 (2) "Algorithm" means a computerized procedure consisting of a
30 set of steps to accomplish a determined task.

31 (3) "Algorithmic accountability report" means the report with
32 content enumerated in section 5(4) of this act.

33 (4) "Algorithmic accountability review board" means the
34 algorithmic accountability review board established under section 6
35 of this act.

36 (5)(a) "Automated decision system" means any algorithm, including
37 one incorporating machine learning or other artificial intelligence
38 techniques, that uses data-based analysis or calculations to make or
39 support government decisions, judgments, or conclusions that cause a

1 Washington resident or business to be treated differently than
2 another Washington resident or business or results in statistically
3 significant disparities with other classes of persons or businesses
4 in the nature or amount of governmental interaction with that
5 individual or business including, without limitation, benefits,
6 protections, procurement processes, required payments, penalties,
7 regulations, timing, applications, or process requirements.

8 (b) "Automated decision system" does not include tools that do
9 not make or support governmental decisions, judgments, or conclusions
10 that cause a Washington resident or business to be treated
11 differently than another Washington resident or business in the
12 nature or amount of government interaction with that individual or
13 business including, without limitation, internal governmental
14 computer servers or electrical usage optimization, antivirus
15 programs, and internal governmental space optimization programs.

16 (6) "Automated final decision system" means an automated decision
17 system that makes final decisions, judgments, or conclusions without
18 human intervention.

19 (7) "Automated support decision system" means an automated
20 decision system that provides information to inform the final
21 decision, judgment, or conclusion of a human decision maker.

22 (8) "Automation bias" means the tendency for humans to
23 overestimate the accuracy of decision support and decision-making
24 systems and ignore contradictory information made without automation.

25 (9) "Identified or identifiable natural person" means a human
26 being who can be readily identified, directly or indirectly.

27 (10) "Office" means the office of the state chief information
28 officer established under RCW 43.105.205.

29 (11) "People" includes a natural person, corporation, limited
30 liability company, limited liability partnership, partnership, or
31 public or private organization or entity of any character, except
32 where otherwise restricted.

33 (12) "Use" means to operate an automated decision system or to
34 contract with a third party to operate an automated decision system
35 to automate, aid, or replace any decision-making process that would
36 otherwise be made by an agency.

37 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 3.** By January 1, 2023, the office of the
38 state chief information officer shall, in consultation with the
39 office of equity:

1 (1) Adopt guidance for agencies regarding the development,
2 procurement, and use of automated decision systems by a public
3 agency. This guidance must incorporate the minimum standards and
4 procedures set forth in sections 4 and 5 of this act with respect to
5 automated decision systems. In adopting the guidance, the office of
6 the state chief information officer must consult with representatives
7 of communities whose rights are disproportionately impacted by
8 automated decision systems as demonstrated by current studies;

9 (2) Develop guidance for agencies to use when prioritizing
10 analysis of automated decision systems. The guidance must include a
11 prioritization framework or frameworks for identifying the order in
12 which to examine existing and proposed automated decision systems.
13 This prioritization framework may include criteria such as whether
14 the system: Creates significant effects on identified or identifiable
15 natural persons; affects many people; involves a high risk of error
16 or bias; has been developed without transparency of the information
17 used to develop the algorithm; or has not been independently tested
18 for bias or inaccuracy.

19 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 4.** Subject to the staged review provisions of
20 this chapter and the responsibility of agencies to establish
21 priorities and timelines for compliance, the legislature finds that
22 the following minimum standards should apply to a public agency's
23 development, procurement, or use of an automated decision system:

24 (1) Agencies and the office of the state chief information
25 officer, in consultation with the office of equity, should adopt
26 interim and then long-term prioritization frameworks for allocating
27 resources to examine and address existing and future automated
28 decision systems and to address any deficiencies found in compliance
29 with this section. The prioritization frameworks should be used in
30 determining the level of resources to be devoted first to examining
31 existing and proposed systems and then to meeting the following
32 requirements of this section.

33 (2) As a part of the procurement process, agencies should assess
34 new automated decision systems procured by them. The assessment
35 should include evaluation of the potential impacts of the automated
36 decision system on: (a) The risk to rights and freedoms to an
37 identified or identifiable natural person; (b) the existence or risk
38 of bias or inaccuracy in the results of the system; and (c) whether
39 the workings of the system are transparent to the public.

1 (3) Automated decision systems currently in use by the state that
2 produce legal effects on identified or identifiable natural persons
3 should be assessed according to the prioritization framework. The
4 assessment should include the existence or risk of bias or inaccuracy
5 in the results and how transparent the system use and impacts are to
6 the public.

7 (4) Agencies should provide transparency of use, procurement, and
8 development of automated decision systems, including monitoring or
9 testing for accuracy and bias, that produce legal effects on
10 identified or identifiable natural persons.

11 (5) Ongoing monitoring or auditing should be performed on
12 automated decision systems that have legal effects on identified or
13 identifiable natural persons to ensure they do not have differential
14 effects on subpopulations that result over time; or discriminate
15 against an individual, or treat an individual less favorably than
16 another, in whole or in part, on the basis of one or more factors
17 enumerated in RCW 49.60.010.

18 (6) Agencies should provide training to state employees who
19 develop, procure, operate, or use automatic decision systems as to
20 risk of automation bias.

21 (7) A public agency that develops, procures, or uses an automated
22 decision system must follow any conditions set forth in the relevant
23 algorithmic accountability report.

24 (8) Subject to the staged implementation as outlined in this
25 chapter, a public agency must, at a minimum:

26 (a) Give clear notice in plain language to the people impacted by
27 the automated decision system of the following:

28 (i) The fact that the system is in use;

29 (ii) The system's name, vendor, and version;

30 (iii) What decision or decisions the system will be used to make
31 or support;

32 (iv) Whether it is an automated final decision system or
33 automated support decision system and whether and through what
34 process a human verifies or confirms decisions made by the automated
35 decision system;

36 (v) What policies and guidelines apply to its deployment; and

37 (vi) How people may contest any decision made involving the
38 automated decision system as required pursuant to this section;

39 (b) Ensure that with respect to newly acquired automated decision
40 systems and, to the maximum extent practicable with respect to

1 existing automated decision systems, that the system and the data
2 used to develop the system are made freely available by the vendor
3 before, during, and after deployment for agency or independent third-
4 party testing, auditing, or research to understand its impacts,
5 including potential bias, inaccuracy, or disparate impacts, provided
6 that the vendor may specify that an independent third party examining
7 proprietary trade secrets shall reveal only the outcome of the
8 examination, and not the content of the trade secrets;

9 (c) Ensure that any decision made or informed by the automated
10 decision system is subject to appeal, immediate suspension if a legal
11 right, duty, or privilege is impacted by the decision, and potential
12 reversal by a human decision maker through a timely process not to
13 exceed 20 days, and clearly described and accessible to people
14 impacted by the decision; and

15 (d) Ensure the agency can explain the basis for its decision to
16 any impacted people in terms understandable to a layperson including,
17 without limitation, by requiring the vendor to create such an
18 explanation.

19 (9) A procurement contract for an automated decision system
20 entered into by a public agency after the effective date of this
21 section must ensure that the minimum standards set forth in this
22 section are able to be effectuated without impairment, including
23 requiring the vendor to waive any legal claims that may impair these
24 minimum standards. Such a contract may not contain nondisclosure or
25 other provisions that prohibit or impair these minimum standards.

26 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 5.** The intent of this section is to structure
27 the way in which public agencies examine their existing and proposed
28 automated decision systems and to identify for the legislature, the
29 governor, and the public instances in which such examination is
30 either incomplete or reveals that the applicable system fails to meet
31 the minimum requirements of section 4 of this act. Subject to such
32 intent:

33 (1) Agencies already using an automated decision system as of the
34 effective date of this section must provide a list of automated
35 decision systems in use to the algorithmic accountability review
36 board by January 1, 2023, and use the prioritization framework
37 established under section 3 of this act or adopt and implement an
38 interim prioritization framework to identify the order in which to
39 complete an algorithmic accountability report on each existing

1 automated decision system by January 1, 2025. For the purpose of this
2 subsection:

3 (a) The algorithmic accountability report must, at minimum,
4 include clear and understandable statements based on information
5 already available to the agency.

6 (b) The algorithmic accountability report must accurately report
7 only the actual direct knowledge contained in the files. Example: If
8 the files contain a statement from the vendor that the system has
9 been examined for bias but there is no report available for
10 examination, the agency may not report that the system has been
11 examined for bias and must instead report that the vendor states that
12 the system has been examined for bias.

13 (c) Agencies may include information not already contained in
14 their files. Example: A bias report conducted by a third party may be
15 included.

16 (d) The list of systems and prioritization frameworks must be
17 available to the public and may include criteria such as whether the
18 system: Creates significant effects on identified or identifiable
19 natural persons; affects many people; involves a high risk of error
20 or bias; has been developed without transparency of the information
21 used to develop the algorithm; or has not been independently tested
22 for bias or inaccuracy.

23 (e) If an agency does not complete an algorithmic accountability
24 report for each automated decision system already in use by January
25 1, 2025, then, unless the agency has been evaluating their systems in
26 good faith based on the established prioritization framework and is
27 granted an extension by the algorithmic accountability review board,
28 the agency must cease use of the unevaluated automated decision
29 system until such time as an extension is granted or the algorithmic
30 accountability report is provided.

31 (f) Any request for extension of the deadline must include a
32 timeline for when each algorithmic accountability report will be
33 provided by the agency.

34 (g) The algorithmic accountability review board shall grant an
35 extension for the continued use of a system if: The agency has
36 established a reasonable timeline for completion of the algorithmic
37 accountability report; and there is no apparent likelihood of bias
38 regarding the system.

39 (h) The algorithmic accountability review board must report
40 annually on agency compliance with this subsection and any extensions

1 granted under this subsection. The report must be made available to
2 the public.

3 (2) A public agency intending to newly develop or procure an
4 automated decision system for use between the effective date of this
5 section and January 1, 2025, must, as a condition of use of such
6 system, at least one month prior to procurement of, or if internally
7 developed, implementation of such a system, produce and file with the
8 office an algorithmic accountability report for that system as
9 described in subsection (4) of this section. In addition to using
10 information already available to an agency, the agency shall conduct
11 reasonable investigatory due diligence including, but not limited to,
12 inquiring of a system provider as to whether studies have been
13 conducted and requesting copies of any studies.

14 (3) An agency intending to develop or procure an automated
15 decision system for implementation after January 1, 2025, must, as a
16 condition of use of such automated decision system, submit an
17 algorithmic accountability report as described in subsection (4) of
18 this section and obtain a finding by the algorithmic accountability
19 review board pursuant to (d) of this subsection. In addition to using
20 information already available to an agency, the agency shall conduct
21 reasonable investigatory due diligence including, but not limited to,
22 inquiring of a system provider if studies have been conducted and
23 requesting copies of any studies.

24 (a) The office must post the algorithmic accountability reports
25 on their public website and invite public comment on the algorithmic
26 accountability report for a period of no less than 30 days.

27 (b) The algorithmic accountability review board may adopt scoring
28 criteria for determining whether the agency's algorithmic
29 accountability report reasonably shows that the automated decision
30 system meets the minimum standards set forth in section 4 of this
31 act.

32 (c) After receiving public comment, the algorithmic
33 accountability review board must review the algorithmic
34 accountability report and comments received to determine whether the
35 agency's algorithmic accountability report reasonably shows that the
36 automated decision system meets the minimum standards set forth in
37 section 4 of this act.

38 (d) On the basis of its review of an algorithmic accountability
39 report, the algorithmic accountability review board shall find that
40 the algorithmic accountability report: (i) Reasonably demonstrates

1 that the system meets the minimum standards set forth in section 4 of
2 this act; or (ii) fails (by stated fact or by omission) to show that
3 the system meets the minimum standards set forth in section 4 of this
4 act.

5 (e) The report of a failure to meet the minimum standards of
6 section 4 of this act must provide a reasonably detailed description
7 from the algorithmic accountability review board of the reasons for
8 the finding and may, but is not required to be, accompanied by a
9 statement by the algorithmic accountability review board of what
10 further information, or changes, or both may be necessary to the
11 content of the algorithmic accountability report or operation of the
12 automated decision system that would result in a finding that the
13 agency's algorithmic accountability report reasonably shows that the
14 automated decision system meets the minimum standards of section 4 of
15 this act.

16 (f) Following a finding that the agency's algorithmic
17 accountability report reasonably shows that the automated decision
18 system fails to meet the minimum standards of section 4 of this act,
19 the applicable agency shall be entitled to revise the information
20 provided, the system, or the procedures for use of the system and to
21 submit a revised algorithmic accountability report to the algorithmic
22 accountability review board for review.

23 (g) All findings and reports of the algorithmic accountability
24 review board regarding whether a system meets the minimum
25 requirements of section 4 of this act shall be posted on the office's
26 website, and a copy of any report finding a failure to meet the
27 minimum requirements of section 4 of this act shall be independently
28 transmitted to the legislature and the governor.

29 (4) Each algorithmic accountability report must include clear and
30 understandable statements of the following:

31 (a) The automated decision system's name, vendor, and version;

32 (b) A description of the automated decision system's general
33 capabilities, including reasonably foreseeable capabilities outside
34 the scope of the agency's proposed use and whether the automated
35 decision system is used or may be used to deploy or trigger any
36 weapon;

37 (c) A description of the purpose and proposed use of the
38 automated decision system, including:

39 (i) What decision or decisions the system will be used to make or
40 support;

1 (ii) Whether it is an automated final decision system or
2 automated support decision system; and

3 (iii) Its intended benefits, including any data or research
4 demonstrating those benefits and whether and where such data or
5 research may be viewed by the public;

6 (d) (i) The type or types of data inputs that the technology uses;
7 (ii) how that data is generated, collected, and processed; and (iii)
8 the type or types of data the system is reasonably likely to
9 generate;

10 (e) Whether there was an examination of potential inaccuracies or
11 bias, or both created during the system's development, design, or
12 implementation as a result of the nature of the data used to inform
13 the system or the system design. If such an examination was
14 performed, a description of the individual or entity who performed
15 the examination, the nature of the examination with sufficient
16 specificity to allow evaluation of its validity, and the results
17 including any steps taken to address the potential inaccuracies or
18 bias, or both must also be included in the report;

19 (f) Whether implementation of the system has produced known
20 erroneous results. If erroneous results were produced, a description
21 of those errors, including the results of any audits conducted to
22 check for erroneous results, together with any steps taken to address
23 the reasons for the erroneous results must also be included in the
24 report;

25 (g) Whether and how people affected by a system decision can
26 review and challenge the basis for that system decision, and a
27 description of the results of any such challenges;

28 (h) A description of any public or community engagement held,
29 whether people and communities affected by the system were consulted,
30 what actions were taken in response to public and community input,
31 and any future public or community engagement plans in connection
32 with the design or use of the automated decision system;

33 (i) Whether the decision algorithm is available for examination
34 by the agency or the public, or both, and to what extent;

35 (j) A description of how the agency plans to comply with each
36 requirement set forth in section 4 of this act;

37 (k) Whether the automated decision system makes decisions
38 affecting the constitutional or legal rights, duties, or privileges
39 of any Washington resident;

1 (l) Whether the system's decisions intentionally differentially
2 affect members of protected classes, such as by selecting persons
3 with disabilities for certain benefits;

4 (m) Whether any of the decision criteria are mandated by statute
5 and, if so, which criteria and by what statutes;

6 (n) Whether there exists a clear use and data management policy,
7 including specific protocols for the following:

8 (i) How and when the automated decision system will be deployed
9 or used and by whom including, but not limited to: The factors that
10 will be used to determine where, when, and how the technology is
11 deployed; and other relevant information, such as whether the
12 technology will be operated continuously or used only under specific
13 circumstances. If the automated decision system will be operated or
14 used by another entity on the agency's behalf, the algorithmic
15 accountability report must explicitly include a description of the
16 other entity's access and any applicable protocols;

17 (ii) Any additional rules that will govern use of the automated
18 decision system and what processes will be required prior to each use
19 of the automated decision system;

20 (iii) How automated decision system data will be securely stored
21 and accessed, and whether an agency intends to share access to the
22 automated decision system or the data from that automated decision
23 system with any other entity, and why; and

24 (iv) How the agency will ensure that all personnel who operate
25 the automated decision system or access its data are properly trained
26 and able to ensure compliance with the use and data management policy
27 prior to the use of the automated decision system;

28 (o) A description of the fiscal impact of the automated decision
29 system, including:

30 (i) Initial acquisition costs;

31 (ii) A reasonable estimate of ongoing operating costs such as
32 maintenance, licensing, personnel, legal compliance, use auditing,
33 data retention, and security costs;

34 (iii) A reasonable estimate of cost savings that would be
35 achieved through the use of the technology; and

36 (iv) Any current or currently identified potential sources of
37 funding, including any subsidies, incentives, or free products being
38 offered by vendors or governmental entities.

1 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 6.** (1) The algorithmic accountability review
2 board is created within the office of the state chief information
3 officer.

4 (2) The board shall represent diverse stakeholders and consist of
5 the following voting members:

6 (a) The director of the office, who shall serve as chair of the
7 board;

8 (b) Six members appointed by the governor, two of whom shall be
9 representatives of state agencies or institutions; two of whom shall
10 be representatives of consumer protection organizations; and two of
11 whom shall be representatives of civil rights organizations or
12 advocacy organizations that represent individuals or protected
13 classes of historically marginalized communities including, but not
14 limited to, African American, Hispanic American, Native American, and
15 Asian American communities, religious minorities, and protest and
16 activist groups. Of the state agency representatives, at least one of
17 the representatives must have direct experience using automated
18 decision systems overseen by the board;

19 (c) Two members shall represent the house of representatives and
20 shall be selected by the speaker of the house of representatives with
21 one representative chosen from each major caucus of the house of
22 representatives;

23 (d) Two members shall represent the senate and shall be appointed
24 by the president of the senate with one representative chosen from
25 each major caucus of the senate.

26 (3) Of the initial members appointed by the governor, two must be
27 appointed for a one-year term, two must be appointed for a two-year
28 term, and two must be appointed for a three-year term. Thereafter
29 members must be appointed for three-year terms.

30 (4) Initial appointments to the board must be made by January 1,
31 2023.

32 (5) Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner that the
33 original appointments were made for the remainder of the member's
34 term.

35 (6) Members of the board shall be reimbursed for travel expenses
36 as provided in RCW 43.03.050 and 43.03.060.

37 (7) The office shall provide staff support to the algorithmic
38 accountability review board.

1 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 7.** (1) Beginning December 1, 2022, and
2 updated not less than quarterly, the office shall make publicly
3 available on its website an inventory of all algorithmic
4 accountability reports on automated decision systems that have been
5 proposed for or are being used, developed, or procured by public
6 agencies.

7 (2) Beginning January 1, 2023, the office shall make publicly
8 available on its website metrics on all approvals, conditional
9 approvals, or denials of agency algorithmic accountability reports to
10 develop or procure automated decision systems for use by agencies,
11 including written explanations of each decision.

12 (3) For automated decision systems implemented prior to January
13 1, 2025:

14 (a) The algorithmic accountability review board shall conduct
15 selective audits of the applicable algorithmic accountability reports
16 and shall make appropriate findings with regard to whether the
17 agency's algorithmic accountability report reasonably shows that the
18 automated decision system audited meets the minimum standards of
19 section 4 of this act. The selective audits conducted must also
20 contain the elements described in subsection (6) of this section. In
21 selecting which systems to audit, the algorithmic accountability
22 review board may take into account:

23 (i) The number of persons affected by the automated decision
24 system, including systems in use by multiple jurisdictions;

25 (ii) The apparent likelihood that the system creates unintended,
26 erroneous, or discriminatory results;

27 (iii) The severity of the effects of an unintended, erroneous, or
28 discriminatory decision on the affected people; and

29 (iv) Other criteria as the algorithmic accountability review
30 board deems appropriate to a selective audit.

31 (b) The office shall establish guidelines by January 1, 2023, for
32 the number or percentage of algorithmic accountability reports to be
33 audited by the algorithmic accountability review board pursuant to
34 (a) of this subsection.

35 (4)(a) Beginning January 1, 2025, the algorithmic accountability
36 review board shall conduct an annual review of agency audits and
37 compile the information into a report that includes the following:

38 (i) Whether each agency that uses, develops, or procures an
39 automated decision system has complied with the terms of its approved
40 algorithmic accountability report;

(ii) Descriptions of any known or reasonably suspected violations of any algorithmic accountability report policies;

(iii) Any systematic issues, such as bias, disproportionate impacts on marginalized or vulnerable communities, raised by use of automated decision systems;

(iv) Recommendations, if any, relating to revision to this chapter or to specific automated decision system algorithmic accountability reports.

(b) The first annual report on agency audits must be made publicly available on the office's website by March 1, 2025, and annually thereafter on or before March 1st.

(5) Beginning January 1, 2024, each agency using an automated decision system must publish on its website annual metrics regarding the number of requests for human review of a decision rendered by the automated decision system it received and the outcome of the human review.

(6) Beginning January 1, 2025, agencies shall conduct an annual audit on automated decision systems that have legal effects on people to ensure that they do not have differential effects on subpopulations that result over time and report to the algorithmic accountability review board any findings. The report must include, at minimum:

(a) Whether the automated decision system has complied with the terms of its approved algorithmic accountability report;

(b) Descriptions of any known or reasonably suspected violations of any report policies;

(c) Any systematic issues, such as bias or disproportionate impacts on marginalized or vulnerable communities, raised by use of automated decision systems; and

(d) Recommendations, if any, relating to revision to the automated decision system algorithmic accountability report.

NEW SECTION. **Sec. 8.** Any person who is injured by a material violation of this chapter may institute proceedings against the public agency deploying the automated decision system in a court of competent jurisdiction for injunctive and/or declaratory relief to compel compliance with this act and if successful shall be entitled to recover their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

1 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 9.** A new section is added to chapter 49.60
2 RCW to read as follows:

3 Except to the extent an automated decision system utilizes a
4 criterion specifically authorized or mandated by state or federal law
5 or regulation, it is an unfair practice under this section for any
6 automated decision system to discriminate against an individual, or
7 to treat an individual less favorably than another, in whole or in
8 part, on the basis of one or more factors enumerated in RCW
9 49.60.010. For the purposes of this section, "automated decision
10 system" has the same meaning as defined in section 2 of this act.

11 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 10.** Sections 1 through 8 of this act
12 constitute a new chapter in Title 43 RCW.

13 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 11.** This act is necessary for the immediate
14 preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or support of
15 the state government and its existing public institutions, and takes
16 effect immediately.

--- END ---